

REMARKS

No new matter is added by this amendment. The present application is a continuation application of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/654,458 filed September 1, 2000. In a prior amendment claims 1-15 were cancelled and new claims 16-38 were added. By this amendment, claims 16 and 33 have been amended, claim 20 has been cancelled, and new claim 39 has been added. Claims 16-18, 21-23, 27-29, and 37-38 stand withdrawn. The claims remaining in consideration are claims 16-39.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing each feature of the claimed invention. New Figures 4 and 5 have been added. Support for the new figures can be found on page 9, line 8 to page 10, line 14 and the claims. The specification has been amended to include reference numbers for the claim elements. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the present office action dated February 23, 2006, the Examiner noted asserted that the previous response filed December 5, 2005 was not fully responsive because claim 16 was amended to read on an unelected species. In a telephone interview with the Examiner on April 14, 2006, applicants attorney indicated to the Examiner that independent claim 24 was generic to all species and if allowed, all pending claims, including withdrawn claims would be allowable. With respect to independent claim 16, the Examiner suggested that applicants rewrite claim 16 in dependent form upon independent claim 24.

New claim 39 is dependent upon independent claim 24 and substantially includes the subject matter of claim 16. It should be noted, however, that as a result of the order of presentation in the respective claims of the coatings, the names, i.e., first and second, are not the same. The correlation is listed below.

Claim 16	Corresponds to	Claims 24 and 39
First Coating		Second Coating
Second Coating		First Coating
Further Coating		Further Coating

Thus, in claim 16 the further coating is applied to the second coating and in claim 24 and 39, the further coating is applied to the first coating. However, both the second coating in claim 16 and the first coating in claim 39 are applied to "at least part of said tip region".

Claims 16-19 and 21 have been indicated as withdrawn. However, applicants again respectfully assert that independent claim 24 is generic to the withdrawn claims, and if found allowable, all claims must be allowed.

Claims 20 and 33 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 20. With respect to amended independent claim 16, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Amended independent claim 16, which corresponds to the embodiment shown in new Figure 4 and described in the paragraph on page 9, beginning on line 8, includes a first coating, a second coating, and a further coating. The first, second and further coatings correspond to the coatings referred to as reference numbers 14a, 14b, and 14c, respectively. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claim 16 is definite under 35 USC §112, second paragraph and requests that the rejection with respect to claim 16 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 33 is dependent upon dependent claim 32, which is ultimately dependent upon independent claim 24. Independent claim 24 corresponds to the embodiment shown in Figure 5. Dependent claim 32 includes a first coating and a further

coating. These correspond to reference numbers 14'a and 14d in Figure 5. Furthermore, dependent claim 32 includes a "the tip region of the nozzle body is coated with a material having a lower thermal conductivity than the thermal conductivity of the nozzle body". This material corresponds to reference number 14b in Figures 4 and 5. Dependent claim 33 has been amended such that the material 14b is a ceramic material. Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 33 is now definite under 35 USC §112, second paragraph and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0 828 075 (Matsushita). Independent claim 16 has been amended to include dependent claim 20.

Matsushita does not teach the structure set forth in amended claim 16. Furthermore, applicants assume that since the Examiner did not reject dependent claim 20 over Matsushita, nor any other prior art, the Examiner recognizes that dependent claim 20 (now independent claim 16) contains allowable subject matter.

Claims 17-18 and withdrawn claims 22-23 are ultimately dependent upon allowable independent claim 16. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 17-18 and 22-23 are also allowable.

Claims 24-26 and 31-35 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Susumu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 24 sets forth an injection nozzle for use in delivering fuel to a combustion space. The injection nozzle includes a nozzle body. At least a part of the nozzle body is provided with a first coating and a further coating. The further coating is

applied to at least part of said first coating to form a multi-layer coating. The multi-layer coating arranged so as to reduce the temperature of at least a part of the nozzle body.

In contrast, the material layer 36 in Susumu appears to be arranged to prevent the adhesion of fuel to the injection nozzle to prevent the accumulation of deposits. Since Susumu is not arranged in such a manner as to reduce the temperature of at least a part of the nozzle body, it lacks at least one element of independent claim 24. Therefore, applicants' respectfully assert that the §102(b) rejection of claim 24 is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 25-26 and 31-35 and withdrawn claims 27-29 are ultimately dependent upon allowable claim 24. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above and based on their own merits, applicants respectfully assert that claims 25-35 are also allowable.

Dependent claim 30 has not been rejected based on prior art. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for recognizing that dependent claim 30 contains allowable subject matter.

Dependent claim 36 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Susuma in view of US Patent 5,987,882 issued to Voss et al ("Voss"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 36 is dependent upon allowable independent claim 24. Voss does not overcome the shortcoming of Susumu with respect to independent claim 24. Therefore, based on the above, and based on its own merits, applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 36 is also allowable.

Dependent claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita in view of US Patent 5,987,882 issued to Voss et al ("Voss"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 21 is dependent upon allowable independent claim 16. Voss does not overcome the shortcoming of Matsushita with respect to

independent claim 16. Therefore, based on the above, and based on its own merits, applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 21 is also allowable.

Dependent claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushita in view of Susuma. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 19 is dependent upon allowable independent claim 16. Susuma does not overcome the shortcoming of Matsushita with respect to independent claim 16. Therefore, based on the above, and based on its own merits, applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 19 is also allowable.

All of the Examiner's objections and rejection having been successfully overcome or made moot, applicants respectfully assert that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

/James R. Yee/
James R. Yee, Reg. No. 34,460
39400 Woodward Avenue, Suite 101
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5151
(248) 723-0349

Dated: April 24, 2006